JA
77
W6
COPY2

FT MEADE
GenColl

WOODROW WILSON

ON

Government in Relation to Business

Address delivered at the Annual Banquet of THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF NEW YORK at the HOTEL ASTOR. . . .

MAY 23rd, 1912.

ALLIED PRINTING TRADES UNION LABEL COUNCIL NEW YORK CITY 173

JK2317
W6
1912

Gift
Democratic Nat. Comm.
Ag 16 '12

ADDRESS BY GOV. WOODROW WILSON AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE ECONOMIC CLUB IN THE HOTEL ASTOR ON MAY 23, 1912.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I listened with a great deal of interest to the very gracious introduction that you have just heard, but with some scepticism upon one of the statements. Mr. Milburn said that everybody here knew what I am, but that depends upon which newspaper he has read. Most persons are so thoroughly uninformed as to my opinions that I have concluded that the only things they have not read are my speeches.

But I want to say that it is with a great deal of pleasure that I find myself here to-night, turning out of the troubled paths of practical politics to come into a place where you have the purpose and the appearance of deliberation. (Applause.) I have never believed entirely that there was very much thinking upon general public questions done in the City of New York; not because there are not some of the finest thinking machines in New York that are to be found anywhere, but because the brains of New York are so devoted throughout long days to special undertakings that there is only the evening, when fatigue has conquered you, in which to think about the affairs of the country. And, therefore, it seems to me that men of eminent success in the fields of business are, above all others, under a moral obligation to get together and talk of things which do not concern their own private undertakings. It is refreshing at this particular time to have an opportunity to discuss, not personalities, but the questions of the day. (Applause.) I was in a New England city, not many weeks ago, which had just been visited on the two preceding days by two militant candidates for nomination. I had occasion at the opening of my speech to say: "After what you people have been through the last two days, perhaps you would like to know what the questions of the day are." I was interested to find that instead of a mere smile, I got out of that audience that had dropped in from the street, a spontaneous cheer. They felt refreshed at the idea that they might hear something discussed which did not have the bitterness of personality in it.

And yet, it is a serious fact, ladies and gentlemen, that it is very difficult to discuss those very questions of the day without seeming to bring a touch of passion and bitterness into them. We talk a great deal about the radicalism of our time, but the radicalism, if you will analyze it, does not consist in the things that are proposed but in the things that are disclosed. It is in the analysis of existing conditions that your public speakers seem to be radical. How shall our difficulties be settled after we have excited our minds by disclosing those conditions? We are so busy with the preliminary controversy with regard to what the real state of the facts is that we carry that extreme over into the other area, which should be an area of calmness, of deliberation, namely the area of the discussion of what shall be done in the circumstances.

Very little has been said about that but a great deal has been said, and sometimes intemperately said, about the real state of affairs. Nowhere, it seems to me, in the country more than in New York ought we to be very frank with one another; because in New York, taking you in the aggregate, you know what the facts are and if you are frank with one another and take the public into your confidence you may be instrumental in instructing the country concerning what it must found its thoughts upon.

When you discuss the relation between government and business, you touch at once the seat of irritation. I have not found a

single audience in this vicinity in which the business men were not up in arms at being interfered with by the action of the government—in which there were not to be found a great many men who said "if the politicians would only let us alone the country would prosper and all business would settle down to a sound and steady condition." They have been critics of government because government would not let business rest and be free. Now, no study of the history of the government can be candidly made which will not lead to this conclusion—that the very thing that government cannot let alone is business, for business underlies every part of our life; the foundation of our lives, of our spiritual lives included, is economic.

I heard a very interesting preacher say several months ago, in preaching upon the sequence of the petitions in the Lord's Prayer, that it was significant that our Savior's first petition was "Give us this day our daily bread," for no man can rationally live, worship, or love his neighbor on an empty stomach; and if he is in doubt where the food is to come from, if he fears he will be without work and sustenance, it is impossible that he should have a rational attitude toward the life of the community or towards his own life. Therefore, it is the object of government to make those adjustments of life which will put every man in a position to claim his normal rights as a living, human being.

Government cannot take its hands off of business. Government must regulate business, because that is the foundation of every other relationship, particularly of the political relationship. It is futile, therefore, to have the politicians take their hands off. They may blunder at the business, but they cannot give it up. They may make fundamental mistakes—they will make a great many if you do not frankly assist and instruct them—but they must go forward whether instructed or not.

I think one of the few grounds of discouragement in our days—for I do not think there are many—is that business men and the lawyers who guide business men are jealously withholding their counsel from those who try to guide affairs, withholding it as those who withdraw in suspicion, as if they should say, "We cannot parley with those men, their ears are not candidly open to us"; and so there has grown up on one side and on the other an attitude of distrust which does not augur well for a settlement of delicate questions.

The whole problem of our life, gentlemen, is to understand one another, the whole problem of politics is to get together. Politics is not a mechanical problem, politics is not a problem of setting interests off against each other upon such a plan as that one cannot harm the other. The problem of politics is co-operation. The organic co-operation of the parts is the only basis for just government; unless we come to an understanding there can be no government. No man can hold off from affairs and count himself a faithful citizen of the Republic.

I have been interested in one piece of speculative explanation, which perhaps I might turn aside for a moment to call to your attention.

One of the chief benefits I used to derive from being president of a university was that I had the pleasure of entertaining thoughtful men from all over the world. I cannot tell you how much dropped into my granary by their presence. I had been casting around in my thought for something by which to draw several parts of my political ideas together when it was my good fortune to entertain a very interesting Scotchman who had been devoting himself to the philosophical thought of the seventeenth century. His talk was so engaging that it was delightful to hear him speak of anything, and presently there came out of the unexpected region of

his thought the thing I had been waiting for. He called my attention to the fact that in every generation all sorts of speculation and thinking tend to fall under the formula of the dominant thought of the age that has proceeded that. For example, after the Newtonian Theory of the universe had been developed, almost all thinking tended to express itself upon the analogies of the Newtonian Theory, and since the Darwinian Theory has reigned amongst us everybody tries to express what he wishes to expound in the terms of development and accommodation to environment. Now, it came to me as this interesting man talked, that the Constitution of the United States had been made under the dominion of the Newtonian Theory. You have only to read the papers of the Federalist to see it written on every page. They speak of the "checks and balances" of the constitution and use to express their idea the simile of the organization of the universe, and particularly of the solar system—how by the attraction of gravitation the various parts are held in their orbits, and represent Congress, the Judiciary, and the President as a sort of imitation of the solar system.

No government, of course, is a mechanism; no mechanical theory will fit any government in the world, because governments are made up of human beings, and all the calculations of mechanical theory are thrown out of adjustment by the intervention of the human will. Society is an organism and every government must develop according to its organic forces and instincts. I do not wish to make the analysis tedious; I will merely ask you, after you go home, to think over this proposition: that what we have been witnessing for the past hundred years is the transformation of a Newtonian constitution into a Darwinian constitution. (Applause.) The place where the strongest will is present will be the seat of sovereignty. If the strongest will is present in Congress, then Congress will dominate the government; if the strongest guiding will is in the Presidency, the President will dominate the government; if a leading and conceiving mind like Marshall's presides over the Supreme Court of the United States, he will frame the government, as he did. There are no checks and balances in the mechanical sense in the constitution; historical circumstances have determined the character of our government. While we were forming the government—that is to say down to a hundred years ago, when the War of 1812 was being fought, while we were finding our place among the nations of the world, while our most critical relations were over foreign relations—the Presidency necessarily stood at the front of affairs. You will find all the early presidents directly forming the government. But after we got our standing among the peoples of the world—from the close of the War of 1812 down to the beginning of the Spanish-American War, with the exception of the interval of the Civil War—the Presidents count for very little. There was then a free, miscellaneous domestic development that was insusceptible of guidance; it was spontaneous; it sprang up unbidden in every part of the country; the place of common counsel was the Congress of the United States; and the Congress overshadowed the President.

One of the things I have always felt that Webster and Clay did not see was that they would diminish their prestige and power if they left the Senate of the United States and entered the Presidency. Why the men who were leading the chamber that was dominating the nation should have wished to be in the chair which was overshadowed by that chamber I have never been able to understand.

But then came the Spanish-American War. Since then America has stood up, looked about her, drawn the veil of preoccupation from her eyes, and beheld herself a great power among the peoples of the world; and ever since that moment the President has,

of necessity, become the guiding force in the affairs of the country. It was inevitable and it now will, no doubt, remain inevitable because we are now in the same case with all other government. We cannot shut our eyes to foreign questions—particularly now when we see some prospect of breaking our isolation by lowering the tariff wall between us and other nations; now that we see some possibility of flinging our own flag out upon the seas again (Applause) and taking possession of our rightful share of the trade of the world.

We have found that the private debates of committees and the haphazard creations of legislation in bodies which no one leads, do not suffice to clear our affairs. We must have some central points of guidance. This is the adjustment to environment; this is the Darwinization of the government of the United States. There is no violence in the process; there is no violence to any principle of our constitution; because, as has been said so often, the beauty of that constitution is that it did not predict anything but left everything possible by the very simplicity and elasticity of its makeup. If the Constitution of the United States had gone into the detail that some of our State constitutions go into, we would have to change it every ten years, on the average, as we have changed them.

Now, all of this that seems pertinent to the matter which I would now bring to your attention, is that there must be some guiding and adjusting force—some single organ of intelligent communication between the whole nation and the government which determines the policy of that nation. And, inasmuch as that determination must turn upon economics, that is to say upon business questions, it is absolutely necessary that we should analyze our present situation with regard to nothing but the facts.

Perhaps I may sum my idea up in this way: The question of statesmanship is a question of taking all the economic interests of every part of the country into the reckoning. Every time any change is to be made in economic policies it must be made by an all-around accommodation and adjustment. Is that possible? There is no man, there is no group of men, who comprehend the entire business interests of this country; it is inconceivable that there should be. At best we can make a very rough and ready approximation of it; and in order that you may make even an approximation it is necessary that there should be a free play of opinion from every part of the country upon the sensitive centre at Washington. Just as soon as one part begins to press harder than another, then the prospect of justice is uncertain, the task of statesmanship is rendered just so much the more difficult. All the sensitive parts of the government ought to be open to all the active parts of it. So soon as a small group of the active parts organize for the purpose of seeing to it that the government hears and heeds only them, then the task becomes impossible.

Let me illustrate it by the tariff, because every business question in this country, whether you think so or not, gentleman, comes back, no matter how much you put on the brakes, to the question of the tariff.

I hear on every side that the tariff was the "dominant" issue. Why, you cannot escape from it no matter in which direction you go. The tariff is situated in relation to other questions like Boston Common in the old arrangement of that interesting city. I remember seeing once, in "Life" a picture of a man standing at the door of one of the railway stations of Boston and inquiring of a Bostonian the way to the Common. "Take any of these streets," was the reply, "either direction." Now. as the Common was related to the former winding streets of Boston, so the tariff question is related to the economic questions of our day. Take any direction and you will

sooner or later get to the Common. In discussing the tariff you may start at the centre and can go in any direction you please.

Let us illustrate by standing at the centre, the Common itself. You know as far back as 1828, when they did not know anything about politics as compared with what we know now, a tariff bill was passed which was called the "Tariff of Abominations," because it did not have any beginning or end or plan. It had no traceable pattern in it. It was as if the demands of everybody in the United States had all been thrown indiscriminately into one basket and that basket presented as a piece of legislation. It has been a general scramble and everybody who scrambled hard enough had been taken care of in the tariff schedules resulting. It was an abominable thing to the thoughtful men of that day, because no man guided it, shaped it, or tried to make an equitable system out of it. That was bad enough, but at least everybody had an open door through which to scramble for his advantage. It was a go-as-you-please, free-for-everybody struggle and anybody who could get to Washington and say he represented an important business interest could be heard by the Committee on Ways and Means. We have a very different state of affairs now. The Committee on Ways and Means and the Finance Committee of the Senate discriminate by long experience among the persons whose counsel they are to take in respect to tariff legislation, because there has been substituted for this unschooled body of citizens that used to clamor at the doors of the Finance Committee and the Committee on Ways and Means, one of the most interesting and able bodies of expert lobbyists that has ever been developed in the experience of any country-men who know so much about the matters they are talking of that you cannot put your knowledge into competition with theirs. Because they overwhelm you with their knowledge of detail you cannot discover wherein their scheme lies. They suggest the change of a fraction in a particular schedule and explain it to you so plausibly that you cannot see that it means millions of dollars additional for the consumer of this country. Again, they propose to put the carbon in our electric lights in two foot pieces instead of one foot pieces and you do not see where you are getting sold because you are not an expert and they are. They have calculated the whole thing beforehand, they have analyzed the whole detail and consequences, each one in his specialty. As compared with him the average unschooled, inexperienced business man has no possibility of competition. Instead of the old scramble, which was bad enough, you got the present expert control of the tariff schedules. Thus the relation between business and government becomes not a matter of the exposure of all the sensitive parts of the government to all the active parts of the people, but the special impression upon them of a particular organized force in the business world, moreover so far as deliberation is concerned, its action, its motions, its actual purposes are secret. Why, it is notorious, for example, that many members of the Finance Committee of the Senate did not know the significance of the tariff schedules which were reported in the present tariff bill to the Senate, and members of the Senate who asked Mr. Aldrich direct questions for information were refused the information they sought, sometimes, I dare say, because he could not give it, and sometimes, I venture to say, because disclosure of the information would have embarrassed the passage of the measure. There were essential papers which could not be got at. Take that very interesting matter, that will-o-the-wisp, known as "the cost of production." It is hard for any man who has ever studied Economics at all to restrain a cynical smile when he is told that an intelligent body of his fellow citizens are looking for "the cost of production" as a basis for tariff legislation. It is not the same in any one fac-

tory for two years together. It is not the same in one industry from one season to another. It is not the same in one country at two different periods. It is constantly eluding your grasp. It does not exist as a scientific, demonstrable datum fact. But, in order to carry out the extraordinary programme proposed in the late national platform of the Republican party, it was necessary to go through the motions of finding out what it was. I am credibly informed that the government of the United States requested several foreign governments, among others the Government of Germany, to supply it with as reliable figures as possible concerning the cost of producing certain articles corresponding with those produced in the United States. The German Government, I understand, put the matter in the hands of certain of her manufacturers, who sent in just as complete answers as they could procure from their books. The information reached our government during the course of the debate on the Paine-Aldrich Bill and was transmitted—for the bill by that time had reached the Senate—to the Finance Committee of the Senate. But I am told—and I have no reason to doubt it—that it never came out of the pigeon-holes of the committee. I don't know and that committee doesn't know what the information it contained was. When Mr. Aldrich was asked about it he first said it was not an official report from the German Government. Afterwards he said it was an impudent attempt on the part of the German Government to interfere with tariff legislation in the United States! But he never said what the cost of production disclosed by it was. If he had it is more than likely that some of the tariff schedules would have been shown to be entirely unjustifiable.

Such instances show you just where the centre of gravity is—and it is a matter of gravity indeed, for it is a very grave matter! It lay during the last Congress in the one person who was the accomplished intermediary between the expert lobbyists and the legislation of Congress. I am not saying this in derogation of the character of Mr. Aldich. It is no concern of mine what kind of man Mr. Aldrich is. Now, particularly, that he has retired from public life it is a matter of indifference. The point is that he, because of his long experience, his long handling of these delicate and private matters, was the usual and natural instrument by which the Congress of the United States informed itself, not as to the wishes of the people of the United States or of the rank and file of business men of the country, but as to the needs and arguments of the experts who came to arrange matters with the committees.

The moral of the whole matter is this: The business of the United States is not as a whole in contact with the Government of the United States. So soon as it is the matters which now give you, and justly give you, cause for uneasiness will disappear. Just so soon as the business of this country has general, free, welcome access to the councils of Congress all the friction between business and politics will disappear.

There is another matter to which you must direct your attention, whether palatable or not. I do not talk about these things because they please my palate; I do not talk about them because I want to attack anybody or upset anyone; I talk about them because I wish to find out what the facts are, otherwise, I will move like a man groping in darkness. If what I say is not true then I am susceptible of correction.

You will notice from a recent investigation that things like this take place: A certain bank invests in certain securities. It appears from the evidence that the handling of these securities was very intimately connected with the maintenance of the price of a particular commodity. Nobody ought, and in normal circumstances nobody would, for a moment think of suspecting the managers of a

great bank of making such an investment in order to help those who were conducting a particular business in the United States to maintain the price of their commodity; but the circumstances are not normal. It is beginning to be believed that in the big business of this country nothing is disconnected from anything else. I do not mean in this particular instance to which I have referred and have in mind to draw any inference at all, for that would be unjust; but take any investment of an industrial character by a great bank. It is known that the directorate of that bank interlaces in personnel with ten, twenty, thirty, forty, sixty boards of directors of all sorts, of railroads which handle commodities, of great groups of manufacturers which manufacture commodities, and of great merchants that distribute commodities; and the reason that a bank is under suspicion with regard to its investments is that it is at least considered possible it is playing the game of somebody who has nothing to do with banking, but with whom some of its directors are connected and joined in interest. The ground of unrest and uneasiness, in short, on the part of the public at large is the growing knowledge that many large undertakings are interlaced with one another, indistinguishable from one another in personnel.

Therefore, when a small group of men approach Congress in order to induce the committee concerned to concur in certain legislation, nobody knows the ramifications of the interests which those men represent, and therefore it is not the frank and open action of public opinion in public counsel, but every man is at any rate suspected of representing some other man and it is not known where the connection ceases. The whole question, therefore, with regard to the relation of government to business is this, gentlemen, not whether there should be a connection, not whether economic legislation should be carefully, studiously, prudently considered, but through whom is the connection to be maintained? Are the contacts to be general or special? Are they to be in the nature of general public opinion or in the nature of private control?

I am one of those who have been so fortunately circumstanced that I have had the opportunity to study the way in which these things come about and therefore I do not suspect any man has deliberately planned these things. I am not so uninstructed and misinformed as to suppose that there is a malevolent combination somewhere to dominate the government of the United States. I merely say that by certain processes, now well known, and perhaps natural in themselves, there has come about so extraordinary a concentration in the control of business in this country that the people are afraid that there will be a concentration in the control of government. That either is so or is not. If it is so, I beg you to observe that I am not a radical in frankly stating it. If it is not so, then I am desirous of your co-operation in order that I may be better informed; for I hold my mind open to every kind of information that I can get; and I have sense enough to know that no one man understands the United States.

I have met some gentlemen who professed they did. I have even met some business men who professed they held in their own single comprehension the business of the United States; but I am educated enough to know that they do not. Education has this useful effect, that it narrows of necessity the circles of one's egotism. No student knows his subject. The most he knows is where and how to find out the things he does not know with regard to it. That is also the position of a statesman. No statesman understands the whole country. He should make it his business to find out where he will get the information to understand at least a part of it at a time when dealing with complex affairs. What we need more than anything else, therefore, is experience meetings, like this—

a universal revival of common counsel. That's what investigations by Congress are for. I do not understand their primary object to be to get anybody in jail or, if it be to find out which men ought to be in jail and which ought not, it is with the confident expectation that it will be discovered that the vast majority ought not to be. But the majority are under suspicion until it is discovered who the minority are who ought to be in jail? No man could even get through a highly reputable company like this without investigation and put his finger on the innocent men. Not until everything about you is known is it possible to separate the sheep from the goats; but I have a confident expectation that the majority of the sheep would be enormous and it would not be necessary to shear them.

You remember it was told of a certain United States Senator that he was so cautious in his statements that he was the despair of every newspaper reporter who sought to interview him. On one occasion he was on a train which was passing through a grazing country and saw a flock of sheep in the field. It was rather late in the season. One of his companions remarked, "That's very singular, those sheep are not sheared yet." The Senator answered, "So it would appear, looking at them from this side."

Now, the shearing time has not come in the great matter we speak of, and I do not think it will come; but the time has come to determine who are responsible for the things that ought not to be done, who are to be set free to do as they please, for that is the problem of honest business and right politics. The problem of politics is, who should be restrained and who should not; and the problem of business is, who should be restrained and who should not. The whole analysis of modern conditions is a discussion of control. Do not get impatient, therefore, gentlemen, with those who go about preaching "We must return to the rule of the people." All they mean, if they mean anything rational, is that we must consent to let a majority into the game. We must not permit any system to go uncorrected which is based upon private understandings and expert testimony; we must not allow the few to determine what the policy of the country is to be. It is a question of access to our own government. There are very few men within the sound of my voice who have any real access to the government of the United States. It is a matter of common counsel; it is a matter of united counsel; it is a matter of mutual comprehension; it is a matter of mutual understanding.

I wish these matters could be more discussed, but it is very difficult to discuss them nowadays; there is too much noise in the air. I feel nowadays, not in gatherings like this, but in gatherings of the ordinary sort, very much as I felt at a certain county fair. The grand-stand by the race-track was set back from the track, I suppose 50 feet, and a speakers' stand had been erected just in front of it, opposite the little pagoda where the judges of races stood; and I was put up to address the grand-stand. Just back of the grand-stand there was a most obstreperous hurdy gurdy accompanying the giddy motions of a merry-go-round, and while I was trying with my voice to compete with that they started a horse race behind my back. Not having the attention of the grand-stand, I did what any normal man would have done: I stopped and watched the horse race. That is an allegory with regard to our present situation. It is very difficult to address the grand-stand, and I am glad I got you off in a corner.

But what is at stake? That's what makes a man's thought infinitely sober, and sometimes touches it with a certain degree of sadness. What is at stake in this business? Why, nothing less than the content, the hope, and the life of the people of this country.

Say what you please, the real basis of disturbance in the field of business just now is the suspicion of the great body of people in the United States concerning the methods and combinations of business; and business cannot breathe an atmosphere of suspicion and live. You must, at any risk, remove that suspicion, or else there can be no normal business in the United States.

What is that suspicion based upon? It is not a contest between the men now in control of business and the men now in control of the government of the United States. It is a contest between those men and the normal life of the country; and there is everything involved. How would it suit the prosperity of the United States, how would it suit the success of business to have a people that went every day sadly or sullenly to their work. How would the future look to you if you felt that the aspiration has gone out of most men, the confidence of success, the hope that they might change their condition, if there was everywhere the feeling that there was somewhere covert dictation, private arrangement as to who should be in the inner circle of privilege and who should not, a more or less systematic and conscious attempt to dictate and dominate the economic life of the country? Do you not see that just so soon as the old self confidences of America, just so soon as her old boasted advantages of individual liberty and opportunity are taken away, all the energy of her people begins to subside, to slacken, to grow loose and pulpy, without fibre, and men simply cast around to see that the day does not end disastrously with them.

For eighteen months now I have been on the inside of some things and I owe it to a very elastic temperament that I have not become cynical. When I know that certain men actually do not possess political liberty because other men hold their notes, then I know that normal conditions do not exist in the United States, and that I do know for I have had it from the mouths of the men who suffered thraldom. When I know that men very prominent in business dare not tell me what they think of some of the circumstances of the organization of modern business except privately and under pledge of confidence, then I know that something sinister has happened in America that has disturbed our intellectual manhood and our political liberty. I have made it my business to talk with men who understand the economic conditions of the country vastly better than I do, because they were concerned in large business transactions, and I have almost invariably found them disposed to ask me not to say where I got my information.

In God's name, gentlemen, where does that point! Is it possible that there is some financial tyranny obtaining in America! It is not necessary that the men who exercise it should entertain tyrannous purposes; they may be unconscious of it; they may feel the same impulse of patriotism that you and I feel. Is it possible that we have allowed the system to grow up which they use and that you and the other men are afraid of them? That's what we have to face; and our stake is the reputation and happiness of a great nation. Alas, that we should have to ask the question! Alas, that men who ask it should be supposed to be desirous of upsetting the institutions of the country! Some of the institutions of this country have been upset already not by political agitators but by those who have exercised an illegitimate control over the government, over the legislatures of the States of the Union. There, again, I am on ground absolutely firm under my feet; for it is the ground of knowledge. I can furnish you a list of the partners and I say that when that is true, if it can be true, then our duty is so plain, so luminous, so attractive, that I do not see how any man can turn away from it. It is nothing less than to rehabilitate our own self-respect and our own liberty; it is nothing less than the op-

portunity, the glorious opportunity, to recover the institutions of the United States, to set them up again in their purity and integrity and see to it that no man dare breathe a single breath of suspicion against them; to see that they are not tarnished by the defiling touch of any man with unclean hands!

We have come to an age when constructive statesmanship is imperative and I thank God for it. Who will be the volunteers? Who will volunteer for immortality? Ah, how men deprive themselves of honor! How men live upon husks and throw away the thing that nourishes! How men lose the happiness of life by not seeing wherein it consists! How men selfishly decline to serve, and so find out the infinite reward of unselfishness? How blind, how self-denying, how stupid we are!

There are some words about which we are very careful. There is not much discriminating use of individual words in America, but there is one word about which we are very careful. We use the word "great" to describe anybody who has been talked about. It does not require character to be great; it only requires size of achievement. You may throttle everybody else and get everything they own and be "great." You may be great and be feared; but there is one word which we bestow with great discrimination and that is the word "noble." You cannot be noble without character, you cannot be noble and not be loved; you cannot be noble and not serve somebody; you cannot be noble and spend every energy you have on yourself.

Who are candidates for this open peerage of America? Who desires the patent of nobility amongst us? Only those who will enter upon this great enterprise of recovering the ancient purity and simplicity of our politics. We can do it by mere candor; we can do it by merely discussing the facts and meeting them. We can do it without disturbing one of the legitimate transactions of business.

I am always afraid that business men who are uneasy have something to be uneasy about; or that, if there is nothing in itself that justifies their uneasiness, perhaps they do not comprehend what their real situation is. You can find it out in this way. Take the experience in Wisconsin. The men who were in control of the public service corporations of Wisconsin fought the plans of that State for the regulation of such corporations as they would have fought the prospect of ruin; and what happened? Regulation of the most thorough-going sort was undertaken and the result was that the securities of those companies were virtually guaranteed to purchasers. Instead of being speculative in value, they were known to be absolutely secure investments, because a disinterested agency, a commission representing the community looked into the conditions of this business, guaranteed that there was not water enough in it to drown in, guaranteed that there was business enough and plant enough to justify the charges and to secure a return of legitimate profit; and every thoughtful man connected with such enterprises in Wisconsin now takes off his hat to the men who originated the measures once so much decaded. The chief benefit, was, not regulation, but frank disclosure and the absolutely open and frank relationship between business and government. That's the advantage. The regulation may in some particulars have been unwise and hasty, but the relationship was absolutely normal and wholesome. That is the way, no doubt, in which a satisfactory relationship is going to be restored between the business of the country and the Government of the United States—by frank disclosure and well-considered readjustment.

Of course, there must be first, a flood of released water. I have sometimes wondered whether that great, obstructing "standpat" dam

was not erected to restrain the release of watered stock. You must let it out sooner or later; and the sooner the better, because if we do it soon we will do it in good temper and if late there is danger it may be done in ill-temper.

What is the alternative, gentlemen? You have heard the rising tide of Socialism referred to here to-night. Socialism is not growing in influence in this country as a programme. It is merely that the ranks of protestants are being recruited. Socialism is not a programme but a protest against the present state of affairs in the United States. If it becomes a programme, then we shall have to be very careful how we purpose a competing programme. I do not believe in the programme of Socialism. If any man can say he knows anything from the past perhaps he can say that the programme of Socialism would not work; but there is no use saying what won't work unless you can say what will work.

A splendid sermon was once preached by Dr. Chalmers on "The Expulsive Power of a New Affection." If you want to oust Socialism, you have got to propose something better. It is a case, if you will allow me to fall into the language of the vulgar, of "put up or shut up." You cannot oppose hopeful programmes by negations. Every statesman who ever won anything great in any self-governing country was a man whose programme would stand criticism and had the energy behind it to move forward against opposition. It is by constructive purpose that you are going to govern and save the United States, and therefore a man ought to welcome the high privilege of addressing an audience like this. You can analyze, you can form purposes. Many of you do know what is going on. You know what part is wrong and what is right, if you have not lost your moral perspective, and you know how the wrong can be stopped.

Very well, then, let us get together and form a constructive programme, and then let us be happy in the prospect that in some distant day men shall look back to our time and say that the chief glory of America was not that she was successfully set up in a simple age when mankind came to begin a new life in a new land, but that, after the age had ceased to be simple, when the forces of society had come into hot contact, when there was bred more heat than light, there were men of serene enough intelligence, of steady enough self-command, of indomitable enough power of will and purpose to stand up once again and say: "Fellow citizens, we have come into a great heritage of liberty; our heritage is not wealth; our distinction is not that we are rich in power; our boast is, rather, that we can transmute gold into the life blood of a free people." Then it will be recorded of us that we found out again what seemed the lost secret of mankind—how to translate power into freedom, how to make men glad that they were rich, how to take the envy out of men's hearts that others were rich and they for a little while poor, by opening the gates of opportunity to every man and letting a flood of gracious guiding light illuminate the path of every man that is born into the world.

FOR PRESIDENT—WOODROW WILSON.

Woodrow Wilson, of New Jersey, should be the Democratic candidate for President.

That is the opinion of The World. That is the counsel of the New Jersey primaries. That is the logic of the situation.

It is time for facts and not for theories. Judson Harmon might prove a strong candidate in New York and Ohio, but his nomination has been rendered impossible. Champ Clark would be a hopelessly beaten candidate in New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. He could do no better than Mr. Bryan, who has lost these States three times and would lose them again if nominated. Oscar W. Underwood is of Presidential size, but he has been untested as a candidate in the North and is an unknown quantity to most of the voters. Woodrow Wilson alone has a record of continuing victory in the section in which victory is essential to Democratic success.

What other Democratic candidate could poll so many votes in the great debatable States of the East—New York, New Jersey and Connecticut?

What other Democratic candidate, who could carry these States, would be so strong in the great debatable States of the Middle West—Ohio and Indiana?

What other Democratic candidate could make so powerful an appeal to hundreds of thousands of thoughtful independent voters without whose support no Democratic President can be elected?

What other Democratic candidate could so well stem the rising tide of Rooseveltism, which now threatens to engulf representative government and Republican institutions?

What other Democratic candidate would so fully measure up to the ideals of the sane radicals and the sane conservatives upon whose joint action the result of the election will hinge?

The World hitherto has withheld its active support from all candidates. It advocated an open convention at Baltimore, and advised its Democratic friends to await the action of the Republicans at Chicago. The open convention is assured. The measure of all the candidates has been taken. The situation is clarified and further delay is unnecessary.

Like a twentieth-century Genghis Khan, Theodore Roosevelt, with his horde of prairie Populists and Wall Street Socialists, is sweeping down upon the Republican National Convention. Mr. Taft seems as powerless to check him as the degenerate Romans were to check the descent of the Goths and the Vandals. The historic party of Lincoln and Seward and Chase and Sumner and Conkling and Chandler and Blaine and Garfield and Harrison and Sherman and McKinley is apparently in the death throes. This is the twilight of the gods, and the Democratic party must rise not only to its opportunity but to its responsibility.

How can it do its duty better than to match sanity against lunacy; statesmanship against demagogy; the historian against the Rough Rider; the educator of public opinion against the debaucher of public opinion; the first term against the third term; the tariff-reformer against the stand-patter; the man who would prosecute trust magnates against the man who protects trust magnates; the man with clean hands against the man who draws his campaign fund from Wall Street; the supporter of constitutional government against the champion of personal government; law against lawlessness; Americanism against Mexicanism; the Republic against the dictatorship?

Who better represents these issues than Woodrow Wilson? Who is better qualified than Woodrow Wilson to appeal to the intelligence and common sense of the American people against the most cunning and adroit demagogue that modern civilization has produced since Napoleon III?

Who would stand a better chance of election in this great national crisis?

Let us look at the facts:

It will require 266 electoral votes to elect a President. The so-called Southern States, including Maryland and Missouri, have 175 votes. Assuming that Arizona will go Democratic too, practically any Democratic candidate for President can count on 178 electoral votes. But 88 more are necessary to victory. Where can these 88 be found.

It is folly to look for them west of the Mississippi River. The West is in the midst of another revival of Populism. In Theodore Roosevelt it has found a new substitute for its gospel of free silver. He is the political reincarnation of James B. Weaver, Mary E. Lease, Jerry Simpson and Peffer. He is the heaven-born ratio of 16 to 1 in a still more fascinating form. It is idle to think that any Democrat could appeal to the West against Roosevelt. It is idle to think that anybody who is not a far more masterful and dangerous demagogue than Roosevelt could command the support of the Populists who now call themselves Republican Progressives.

The Democratic party, if it is to win the election and safeguard Amreican institutions, must unite the East and the South as Tilden did in 1876. The candidate must carry New York with its 45 electoral votes. He must carry New Jersey with its 14 electoral votes. He must carry Cincinnati with its 7 electoral votes. To lose these States is to give Roosevelt a walkover. To win these States is to win not only 66 of the 88 electoral votes that are needed, but in all probability it is to win Ohio with 24 votes; it is to win Indiana with 15 votes, which is the historical political ally of New York and New Jersey; it is to give the Democratic party an opportunity of victory in Massachusetts with its 18 votes, and to bring Delaware with its 3 votes back into the Democratic column. In other words, it is to elect a Democratic President of the United States.

It is in the East that Democratic victory must be won. It is in the East that Rooseveltism must be overthrown. It is the East that must save the country from a third term and all it implies. For that reason The World regards Woodrow Wilson as the strongest candidate the Democratic party can nominate.

The New Jersey primaries were a vital test of his political strength not only in New Jersey but in New York. They proved that local opposition to him is largely a myth. Although the campaign against him was well organized and abundantly financed, it failed miserably. He swept the State, and the only four delegates he lost were lost through the personal efforts of James Smith, Jr., a political boss whom Governor Wilson kept out of the United States Senate. In a section of the country where Wall Street and the political bosses are most powerful, Governor Wilson demonstrated that he has the confidence of the rank and file of the party, without which any man's candidacy is futile. He demonstrated as well that his political strength is the kind of strength that is essential to Democratic success in the vitally necessary States of New York, New Jersey and Connecticut.

So much for that.

During Governor Wilson'n public career The World has been compelled to take issue with him on many questions. We regarded with grave misgivings his sudden conversion to the initiative and

referendum, reversing the principles of a lifetime. We regretted his apparent disposition to imitate Mr. Bryan's sweeping charges against the so-called Money Trust without supporting these charges with facts and specifications. We regretted his long campaign tours, his too eager chase after the nomination, and certain symptoms of instability which threatened to weaken his public usefulness. We have not hesitated to warn him when we thought he was going astray, and shall not hesitate to do so again in the future.

But Governor Wilson's elements of weakness are vastly overbalanced by his elements of strength. He has proved his political courage and his fearlessness. He has proved himself sound on tariff reform. He has proved himself sound on the Sherman law. He has proved himself sound on corporation control. He has proved himself sound on trust prosecutions and personal guilt. He has proved himself sound against government by Wall Street plutocracy. He has proved himself sound on the independence of the judiciary. He has proved himself sound on the fundamental principles of constitutional government. He has proved that he is instinctively and temperamentally a Democrat. He has proved himself a free man who cannot be bulldozed by bosses or influenced against his convictions even by his personal friends. That is the sort of man who ought to be President.

Governor Wilson has had more public experience than Grover Cleveland had when he was elected President. He is better known to the rank and file of the party than Samuel J. Tilden was when he was nominated for President. The World believes that he would be a progressive constitutional President whom the American people could trust and for whom they would never have cause to apologize.

We appeal to all Democrats to consider this matter soberly and thoughtfully and without prejudice. We appeal to the delegates to the Democratic National Convention to be swayed by no considerations except those of principle and the public welfare. We appeal to Mr. Bryan to throw his great political influence upon the side of Governor Wilson and aid the Democratic party to meet adequately this great crisis in the Nation's history. He has the most brilliant opportunity for disinterested, patriotic leadership that has come to any American of this generation, and he has before him in Theodore Roosevelt a striking example of the meaning of ruthless and unyielding ambition.

It is not in behalf of Woodrow Wilson that The World urges his nomination. It is not merely in behalf of the Democratic party as a party. It is in behalf of the American people. It is in behalf of American institutions. It is in behalf of the Republic. It is in behalf of the Nation that is now confronted with the gravest menace that it has faced since the obliteration of human slavery and the overthrow of secession.

500

139

SEPT 68
N. MANCHESTER, INDIANA

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 011 798 710 3